



BUILDING AUTHORITY

CITY OF NOVI

Building Authority Meeting

Thursday, March 6, 2008 | 9 A.M.

Council Chambers | Novi Civic Center | 45175 W. Ten Mile Road
(248) 347-0445

Meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.

Members Present: Larry Czekaj, Julie Farkas, Rob Hayes, Clay Pearson, Steve Rumble, Kathy Smith-Roy, Mark Sturing

Others Present: Mary Ellen Mulcrone, Ramesh Verma, Melissa Place,

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Farkas, seconded by Smith-Roy; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve the agenda as presented.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. February 21, 2008 meeting

The approval of minutes was deferred to the March 20, 2008 meeting.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

1. Further discussion with Architect Diamond and Schmitt Associates

Mr. Schmitt opened discussion by listing three components for discussion, a) additional comments, b) cost estimate, and c) schedule. These components will be discussed as part of the schematic plan.

2. Review of Schematic Plans for possible approval

Mr. Schmitt opened discussion.

Proposed Site Plan 2

a) The curve entryway option came from the comments of the Building Authority as recommended by the City's traffic engineer

Another issue was the shift of the parking lot to the south for a greener north end. This model allows those features. Mr. Pearson asked if two more parking lanes could be added to the south instead of waiting for the expansion. Mr. Pearson said the sidewalk from the high school crosses drop-off traffic lane twice, and asked the architect to consider moving the sidewalk away from the drop-off material lane. Mr. Czekaj asked if the plan meets required parking spaces. Mr. Schmitt said it exceeds. Mr. Czekaj said the loss of one stall for a sidewalk entry is not detrimental if that would allow the sidewalk from the high school to be moved away from the drop-off material lane.

The emergency exit on the east side of the site needs to be made smaller on the plan, Mr. Pearson said. A comment from the public forum was to have a third lane at the entrance as a dedicated right turn lane. Mr. Schmitt said that can be done. Mr. Czekaj prefers Proposed Site Plan 1. Mr. Schmitt commented Proposed Site Plan 2 was to give an option for traffic flow. There is more of an opportunity to control traffic movements.

Mr. Czekaj asked what kinds of trees will be planted. Mr. Schmitt said that has not been determined yet. Mr. Czekaj said the current renderings have an institutional look. He would like to see varied species. Mr. Schmitt said the plantings will be determined with the landscape plans in the future. Mr. Hayes asked if the plans are shown as half scale. If so, the entrance needs to be wider than the 24' to accommodate a third lane. Mr. Schmitt said that will be reflected in the drawing.

Mr. Pearson asked for clarification of how people will enter the site from the west without having to go all the way around to the north side to enter the site. He would like to see a sidewalk at the west side of the building for pedestrians. Mr. Schmitt said they can develop a landscape and a sidewalk next to the loading bay on the south side.

Mr. Pearson asked if the 'notch' on each end of the building could be removed. It is an expensive element. Mr. Czekaj voiced that he likes the notch. It gives dimension to the building in his opinion. Mr. Schmitt said the wall could be straight. Mr. Czekaj asked if the 'notch' was removed would the stairs be moved. Mr. Schmitt said that could be a possibility. Ms. Farkas asked if there was anything to lead people along the emergency path. Mr. Schmitt said there will be a hard surface to move people away from the building. Mr. Czekaj asked if the terrace activity provides access to restrooms. Mr. Schmitt confirmed people would need to access the restrooms through the library. Ms. Farkas asked if there could be a gate to the Fuerst property. Mr. Schmitt said they will take a look but the gate would need to be controlled by staff.

Mr. Sturing asked if there was a way to have more handicapped parking. Mr. Schmitt said there is enough by code. Jessie Waese said there are seven with one being van accessible planned. Mr. Czekaj asked if one more could be added. Mr. Pearson said if there is extra money, additional parking could be built now. Mr. Czekaj commented the Board spent a lot of money at Meadowbrook Commons and the additional parking is not utilized. An option might be to include additional parking as an alternate bid, Mr. Pearson commented to design and have ready when needed.

Mr. Kittides said there needs to be a decision on the schematic. Mr. Schmitt asked if Proposed Site Plan 2 with the mentioned modifications was the selection by the Building Authority. Mr. Pearson said yes.

Motion by Sturing, seconded by Pearson; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To approve Proposed Site Plan 2 as the design scheme with the afore-mentioned modifications.

- 3 lanes (dedicated right turn lane)
- Emergency route reflected smaller on plans
- High school walk through vegetation
- Sidewalk along south side of building to Fuerst property
- Notch removed
- Gate to Fuerst property from terrace
- Option for additional parking

b) Cost Estimate

Mr. Schmitt referred to the independent estimates based on 57,000 square foot building. Both estimates are over budget. The 20% contingency is included in the numbers. He reminded the

Building Authority that the contingency includes items that have not been designed to this point. The contingency number as a % reduces as additional elements are defined and designed.

c) Schedule

Mr. Schmitt needs approval on cuts to the current design prior to the bid documents creation. We should not defer the scope until later. We need direction. Mr. Kittides said the discrepancy is in excess of \$1 million. The removal of 5 feet on the west side (2,000 square feet) is an option to reduce cost significantly. Mr. Schmitt would like to tighten up the budget now. If the bids come in under budget we can add items later. Mr. Sturing requested to review the details of both BEI's estimates as well as the other firm's estimates. Mr. Schmitt commented it is not wise to reduce the construction contingency at the schematic level.

Mr. Sturing is not sure if/what items if any were added. If Diamond and Schmitt thinks items have been added, can they be identified? Mr. Schmitt mentioned the automatic materials handling and the children's story room were added. Mr. Sturing asked what is driving the cost that we did not know from nine months ago? Mr. Schmitt said the area programming was \$180 square foot. The Skanska firm as estimated at \$245 a square foot for this building. This is a big difference. Mr. Sturing commented two floors are cheaper to construct. Mr. Sturing replied the \$180 square foot for the Northville Township Hall is where this square footage cost was derived. Mr. Pearson said the list that Mr. Kittides distributed is a normal course for consideration and a reduction of square footage needs to be made sooner rather than later. Mr. Schmitt said the deeper we go into the processes the harder some reductions become. The list of options to maintain, keep, delete or to move forward is realistic.

Ms. Smith-Roy said the reduction of square footage is something that should be reviewed. Energy costs continue to rise. She would like to see the addition of grey water use for irrigation or an alternative, left in the budget. There may be increases on staff operating costs, etc. as a result of staff review and the two-story operation. Mr. Czekaj said these issues will not be resolved today. How does the possible loss of 2,000 square feet impact the design? Where does the space come from? Mr. Kittides said a 5 foot slice from the west wall. Mr. Schmitt said the west wall would come in and no difference will be noted. However, it will help the budget. We can draw that change now. If not now, we will face this issue soon. Mr. Pearson suggested the Library staff and Board look at the option of reduction of 2,000 square feet in all areas of the building not just from the public space. The elimination of 2,000 square feet gets the project cost closer to budget. Mr. Kittides again stressed the importance of a design approval today. Some items on the list can be alternates in the bid package. Mr. Czekaj said the removal of 2,000 square feet of public space worries him. Ms. Farkas agrees. Mr. Schmitt will maintain the list of options.

Mr. Hayes said the design s-curve always gets more expensive. Ms. Farkas asked to include as an option a straight wall. What is the cost of the curved wall? What is the cost of a straight wall? Mr. Schmitt said there is no premium on a curve. Mr. Czekaj asked if we are giving up 2,000 square feet, can the footage be divided into reductions from the public and from staff office space. Ms. Farkas commented we really need to look at where this space is coming from. She has great concern for scaling back in public space. Mr. Sturing commented the children's area has moved. The meeting room height can be reduced. What does it cost to have a floor above the meeting room? Mr. Schmitt said if the floor is added this increases mechanical systems and finishes which is an expense. Mr. Czekaj asked what is the savings to take reduce the meeting room height? Mr. Sturing thought about \$30,000. Mr. Schmitt agrees.

Interior Plans

Mr. Schmitt commented there have been some general changes.

Ground Floor

- Children circular room only has been eliminated
- Youth Activities Room is located in the corner
- Open space with stacks and soft seating
- Youth service desk
- Vending café
- Group study rooms along the circulation area
- Automated sorting (will be resolved in a few weeks)

Mr. Sturing asked if the elevator opens on both sides. Mr. Schmitt said an elevator will be at a cost premium to open on both sides. Ms. Smith-Roy said it increases operating cost. Mr. Czekaj asked how much? Mr. Schmitt quoted in the \$50,000 - \$70,000 range.

Second Floor

- Young Adult
- Open spaces
- Copier Center
- Service Desk
- Adult Collection
- Group Study Rooms
- Staff Offices
- History Room
- Mechanical Systems

Mr. Czekaj said that appears to be a lot of space for mechanical. Can the systems be moved to the roof? Mr. Schmitt said operating costs get more expensive with units mounted outside. It is most cost effective to have the systems at this location. Ms. Smith-Roy prefers enclosed.

Mr. Czekaj asked why the children's area was moved. Ms. Farkas commented the children's story area was moved to the southeast corner for the containment of noise. The previous space now has seating and a fireplace.

Mr. Schmitt asked for authorization to move forward with the plan. Ms. Farkas approves with the 57,000 square footage to move forward. Mr. Sturing agrees. Ms. Smith-Roy does not agree because of the square footage. Mr. Schmitt asked if the plan captures what and how it is going to function. Mr. Sturing believes comments from the previous week have been addressed and is satisfied in principle for the design to move forward. Mr. Czekaj asked if there is enough study spaces. Ms. Farkas said yes. Mr. Czekaj said the youth area corners looks boxy. Mr. Sturing said glass is on one side. Ms. Farkas preference was to move these elements. Mr. Hayes agrees with the concept as long as the options mentioned in this meeting are addressed. Mr. Czekaj asked about the service elevator. Mr. Schmitt said they will look into costs and get back with the Board. Ms. Smith-Roy asked that maintenance costs be included. Mr. Schmitt said fine.

3. Update on Technology Consultant

Ms. Farkas explained the review team met on March 4, 2008 to assess the results of the proposals. After that assessment, two companies were asked to interview. That interview is scheduled for

March 13, 2008. A recommendation might be brought forward to the Building Authority at its March 20, 2008 meeting.

4. Discussion and determination of how the Building Authority wants to process payments (i.e. staff approval or Building Authority)

Ms. Smith-Roy said most items are deferred to various staff for payment approval. The consensus was that construction pay estimates will come to the Board. Ms. Smith-Roy confirmed that any other payments will be approved by the appropriate staff (i.e. bond payments, legal costs, etc.) if the item is not over budget.

5. Next meeting scheduled: March 20, 2008 at 8 a.m.

Motion by Smith-Roy, seconded by Sturing; CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY: To adjourn the meeting at 10:44 a.m.

Minutes approved March 20, 2008